

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending. Claims 6-8 have been allowed. Reconsideration and allowance based on the following comments are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Brunts, et al. (U.S. 5,887,269) and claims 4-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brunts in view of Sasaki, et al. (U.S. Pub 2002/0083065). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Brunts teaches a navigation system which obtains navigational information including road data, destination information etc. through removable memory cards. In Brunts navigational system, various databases of map data are stored on separate readable memory cards. The navigation system obtains all its data from the memory cards themselves. Thus, when a user desires new data or different data, a memory card which contains the desired data is inserted into the memory card interface 36 enabling the system to obtain the data from the memory card. See column 6, line 66 through column 7 line 65.

Brunts system does not update information at predetermined intervals, does not determine newest information between a fixed and updated information nor does it communicate with systems of cited navigation unit to acquire the updated map information. Brunts system relies upon memory cards which are inserted into the navigational unit from which the system obtains new or different map information. The user selects the memory cards to insert. A determination between the different information on the cards by the system of Brunts is not made. Further, the memory cards are inserted at the users discretion, not on a predetermined basis.

Therefore, Brunts fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a storage part that stores users service information including fixed information which is updated at intervals of a predetermined

period and update information which is updated at intervals of a period shorter than the predetermined period; determination means that determines, in response to the instruction provided by the operation means, on each of the fixed information and the update information whether or not the users service information stored in the storage part is the newest line of communication means that acquires, from outside, newest information corresponding to at least one of the fixed information and the update information which are determined to be not the newest by the determination means, as recited in claim 1.

Brunts also fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a storage part that stores users service information including fixed information which is updated at intervals of a predetermined period and update information which is updated at intervals of a period shorter than the predetermined period and communication means that transmits, in response to the request from outside, at least one of the fixed information and the update information which are stored in the storage part, as recited in claim 5.

Further, Sasaki fails to make up for Brunts deficiencies. Sasaki refers to a control system for various applications. The Office Action provides Sasaki to teach the use of an information supply server which is recited in claim 5. Although Sasaki teaches the use of servers, Sasaki's server is a conventional server that stores data and provides data when requested. Sasaki does not teach or suggest the use of a server in the manner recited in claim 5.

Therefore, in view of the above, applicants respectfully submit that Brunts fails to teach each every feature of independent claim 1, as required. Further, the combination of Brunts and Sasaki fails to teach each and every feature of independent claim 5 as required. Dependent claims 2-4 are also distinguishable over the cited references for the above reasons as well as for

the additional features they recite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-5 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings (Reg. No. 48,917) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 1, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Michael R. Cammarata
Registration No.: 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant